App F IX-4

Previous references

1930. File No. L.4-30

Serial Nos. 1 — 14

Later references

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Serial Nos. 14

Par B for July 32

SUBJECT.

Appeal re Sri Rangamma Sivan Thalegudi Pariahari ke ~~post~~ letter

to. The Mess Comr.

No 125 of 18-7-32

Do remark that in view of fact petitioner has no claim to any ~~Govt~~ higher emolument

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Mwg File No. 64 of 1930

Serial No.	
1	Petition dated 31.7.30 from Ved. Stanic Raja Iyengar. Sree Ranganatha Swamy Sannidhi Paricharak. prays that the Scale Sanctioned in G.O: no: 639-41/ Mwg. 379-21-2 dated 9. 8. 22 be ordered given effect to pending his appeal which he says will be preferred as soon as he is furnished with a Copy of the Mwg. Comm'r's order. (1) First Member's order on the petition. "No Stay order can be issued" M.N.K. 31.7.30. (2) Submitted with a draft Endt: for kind approval. Filing of the appeal will, if approved, be awaited. Gs 5/8
	Appeal petition dated 4.8.30 from Sri Stanic Raja Iyengar. Sri N. Ranga Sannidhi of Serangapatam appealing against the Mwg. Comm'r's order in regard to the restoration of Paricharike work of Gothanalaga. dies in the Sri Ranganatha Swami temple at Serangapatam First Member's orders on the appeal petition.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD 066—GPB—30,000—26-7-29

Mug File No. 64 of 1930-1

Serial No.

"Records may be called for

(SWD) M.N.K
4.8.30.

(1) Subd with a draft. to the Mung. Comm calling for a report as per Member's orders (Two drafts. for approval).

GS MSR 5.8.30

Issue
VS
7.8.30

To The Mung Comm
no 304 f. 8-8-30
Forwards the petn in ol. for report with records

2. To Sthanikam
& Rajasingar. Seringapatam
no. 305 f 8-8-30
Informs that his petition was sent to M'C for report & the question will be settled after the receipt of report.

SWS. MSR 13.8.30

3 Letter no 307 f 23/10/30 from the Mungai Commissioner forwarding the entire records connected with the appeal petitions of (1) Sanika Rajadigaru (2) N. Ramaswamiengar of Seringapatam against the orders passed in his Ori above two petitions of Panchami Lands in the Sri Ranganatha Swamy Temple

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD 066—GPB—30,000—26-7-29

General and Revenue Secretariat. No. 3 File No. 64 of 192

Serial No.

2) The facts of the case are fully set forth by M.C. in his addl memo No 15 of 24/7/30 and

3) Subj to the reference to para 3 of the note.

Law Secy 4.11.30

4 The parties may perhaps be heard. The Govt orders were made on their various by local officers on account of certain difficulties, and the parties will probably be satisfied if they are given a hearing

M/Members 18.11.30

5 yes csx 19/11

24.11.30

10 Orders are reserved as to the date on which the case may be posted

24/11 1st Member

Members adm 26.11.30

12 May be posted for hearing at 2-30 P.M. on Saturday the 13th Dec '30

26/11

OFFICE OF THE FIRST ASSISTANT 10 NOV 1930 No. 5071

OFFICE OF THE FIRST ASSISTANT 26 NOV 1930 No 5324

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD 066—GPB—80,000—26-7-29

Genera and Revenue Secretariat Mgs. File No. 64. of 1930.

Serial No.

notices to the petitioners only Viz Sthanika Raja Iyengar (2) N. Rangaswamiengar in Ranganathaswami temple at Seringapatam are put up for appl[illegible]. It is submitted that there appears to be no need to issue notices to the alleged opponent (vide P. W. D) Sthanika Rangaswamiengar. By redistribution of work & the fixing of salaries vide M.S.O. No 639-41/Mg 379-21-2 dt 9-8-22, the petitioners may have been subjected to some hardship.

For orders
28/11

Isaye
28.11.30

Issued No 1224 dt 28/11/30 to the Amildar Seringapatam forwarding the notices referred therein for being served on the petitioners Sthanik Raja Iyengar & N. Rangaswamiengar - Sri Ranganatha temple Seringapatam -

Instructions issued in the Branch.

Put up notice to Sthanika Rangaswamy of Seringapatam".

Submitted notices accordingly

5/12

The English alternation form suggested as it has been so done that the petition to be filed is not an alleged application

Isaye
5.12.

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 02553—GPB—50,000—8 7 30

Serial No.

3690/28 9

Petition dated 19.9.30 from Sam
yalcamma represented by her nephew
Ramya Bhatta appealing against the ord
of the Mucg. Commr. dated 26.7.30
re. the paricharaka ship of certain Sut
Gudies

(1) The dlc's order which is appealed ag
is not produced. May the appellant be
asked to produce the Mucg. Commr's order

GS MSK (2) For land orders.
29/9 H. Leey)

VS
27.9.30

(3) Yes — As the appeal is time

29.9.30

VS
30.9

(4) Subd with a draft. The appeal seems to be in time as it is stated that the Dist's order is ~~passed~~ dated 28.7.30

3882/10 X

GS MSK
7/10 H. Leey)

VS
8.10.30

Issue
VS
21.10.30

NOTE.—Contn. Sheet

WD 02553—50,000—GPB—8 7 ..

1)

64

1168

File No. 154 of 198

2

In Kesavanga Bhattar
Srirangapatam

No 907 of 29-10-30
with reference to rl 1 informs
that he should produce a copy of
the order called against

SUS
24/10 V

Petition of 27.11.30 from Keshavarangya
Bhatta nephew of Somanayakamma
wife of Krishna Bhatta praying
for a copy of the Inamdar Commissioner's
order in appeal No 15 of 1929-30

(7) Vide the latter file mng 64 30-1 Agraharam
The records received from the Inc. (Mysore) have been posted for 13 Dec-30
In appeal case 15 of 1929-30 before Inc Somanayakamma representing this court
was the respondent alongwith Messrs N Ranga Swamiengar & Sriranga Raja Ogursa

8) Kesavarangya Bhatta
says that he is the nephew of Somanakamma
but he has not produced any authority from the lady
that he is her representative for purposes
of this appeal and whether the appl. pet. filed by Keshava Rangya Bhatta
could be entertained is for orders

9) The circumstances under which
Copies could not be produced have been explained
in the P.R. of May the applicant be exonerated
from producing a copy if his appl. is ordered to be admitted
A copy of case Scott may be consulted

4.36
5

24/12

H. Secy) 10) 5.12.30

Serial No.

11) Is the appeal petition otherwise in order and fit to be admitted? Under what provision of law is the appeal preferred?

12) Reference may be made to the record sent by the M.C.

24/11/30

13) Under 38-(2) of the Mung. Regn. the appl. is rejected. The appeal petition may be taken to be in order in all respects. It is sufficiently stamped and preferred in time. Kind reference is invited to the file belonging to the office of the Mung. Comm^r. (Flags T + Z) in the linked file Mung 64-30. Krishna Bhatta since deceased and represented by Somanayakamma was one of the respondents. The present appellant says that he is the nephew of Somanayakamma but he has produced no authority from the lady proving that he represents her.

14) It is respectfully submitted that there will be no room for appeals of the kind if the M.C. were to issue necessary instructions for the distribution of Subhalgudi Paiga as were based upon the stand held by the respective petitioners so as not to affect the remuneration they were drawing for several years.

15) This and allied cases may be decided together as the Jt. Comm^r

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

WD 025 [illegible] GRP—8-7-30

File No. of 193 | General and Revenue Secretariat





It was ordered in both the cases and 5 were adjudged together by the Nyapai Commissioner

9/1/31 H. Seey) 10/ 9.1.31

3rd member) 10/1/31

17/1/31

May be posted to next date of hearing

25.2.31

This case was heard on 23rd March 1931.

The petitioners Sthanik Rajaiengar, Narsipur Rangaswami Iyengar and Keshavaranga Bhatta representing Somanayakamma, widow of Krishna Bhatta, were all present. Sthanik Rangaswami Iyengar, the counter-petitioner, was also present and was represented by his lawyer Mr. L.S.Raju.

598
24/3

According to the old scale, Somanayakamma's (Krishna Bhatta's) remuneration per month was about Rs 8/- and it has been

Serial No.

raised to Rs 12/- under the revised scale. Her claim to the rice allowance attached to the Parichardkiship of three Sutlagudis, in addition to increased emolument is untenable.

23 Sthanik Rajaiengar represented that he was originally in receipt of the following four allowances:-

(1)	Rs	6- 0- 0
(2)		2- 8- 0
(3)		1- 8- 0
(4)		1- 4-11
	Rs	11- 4-11.

24 He stated that, as against Rs 11-4-11 he was receiving, his remuneration per month under the revised scale was only Rs 8/-. It is necessary to enquire if his claim to all the four allowances was based upon hereditary Huk. If he had no hereditary Huk claim to all of them and if what is now allowed to him is not less than what he was entitled to, taking only the established hereditary claims into calculation, there is no need to revise the order of 1922.

25 Narsipur Rangaswamiengar represented that he was receiving prior to the introduction of the new scale, the following items:

(1)	Rs	6- 0- 0
(2)		1- 4-11
(3)		3- 0- 0
	Rs	10- 4- 11.

26 He stated that, as against Rs 10-4-11 his forme emolument, his present emolument under the revised scale was only Rs 8/-. An enquiry similar to that

NOTE—Contn Sheet

WD 0255—GPB—50,000—8 7 30

suggested

suggested above in regard to Sthanik Rajiengar is necessary in this case also -

A petition was presented in the course of the hearing by Mr. N. Kesava Iyengar, Lawyer on behalf of ~~the petitioner~~ one Sthanik Sampatkumarachar and a report on the representation made in it may be obtained.

Reference to the Muzrai Commissioner may be made as proposed above.

2/4/31

2/4/31

End to be put up as directed in para 22 is also wrong.

Please put up typed drafts

2.4.31

Fair drafts submitted
For kind perusal before issue

4.4.31.

8063
6/4

Issue draft - DMC. Put up

11/4

Orders of the Sec issued in para 21.
Do not issue Encl to Summons mentioned.
After the appeal is finally disposed of, orders may issue together on all the representations

3/4

General and Revenue Secretariat — File N of 1930.

Serial No.	
6	No 2374/30 4-31 To The Mysore Commissioner Calling for confidential information in respect of the representation made by Messrs Shamia Raja Iyengar and Narasimha Rangaswamiengar of the Sri Ranganathaswami temple Seringapatam.

Representation from Non-Subordinate of the Parakala Mutt re: worship in Sri Vedanta Desikachar Sannidhi in the Hundred Pillared Hall.

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No. 4423 of 1930.1

Serial No.

(1) Petition of 10.4.31 from the Vaishavaranga Bhattar stating that he has a hereditary claim for three Sattalgodi Panchanka work and requesting that the particular work be got back to him.

(2) Petition of 10.4.31 from the Shanik Rajagopa of the Sri Raghunatha Swami Temple Srirangapatana requesting that the file of papers relating to Ubhayakhas Paragana be called for from the Srirangapatana Taluk office and he be put in charge of Sattalgodi to which he has a claim.

(3) Petition of 28/4/31 from the N. Ranganarasimhaiengar Jagasale Panchanka Vidwan of the Sri Raghunatha Swami Temple Srirangapatana. Complaining that he has been unjustly deprived of the Panchangam work of certain Sattalgodi to which he has a claim & requesting that the above Panchanka work be got back to him.

The three petitioners personally appeared before the Member of Council on 23/5/31, the day of hearing.

From the representa-

NOTE—Contn Sheet

WD 02553—50,000—GPB—8-7 30

made, the 1st petitioner was found to have sustained no loss of pay under the revised scale. On the other hand he was found to be drawing nearly 12 Rs p.m. ie Rs 4 more than under the previous scale.

His present grievance is that he has been deprived of certain Tullalgudi work.

The second and the 8th petitioners stated that they were found to have sustained loss of pay by the revision of 1922. A report has been called for. Now they pray that their claim to certain Tullalgudi work be considered & they be put in charge of the particular works.

It appears a report will be called for from the Dr. C. for consideration at the time of first hearing

G.S. 2/5/31
30/4 H. Secy)

30.4.31

30/4 1.5.31

Issue.

G.S. 11/5/31

Issue
1.5.31

General and Revenue Secretariat — File No. — of 1931

Serial No.

No 2406 of 6/5/31 to the Inam Commissioner Calling for a report

Letter No — of 6.4.31 from Shanik Ranganathanandaru, respondent in the Appeal tendering certain certified copies —

Petition of 20.4.31 from Shanik Raja Iyengar tendering certified extract of Barabard for September 1899 —

Petition of 24.4.1931 from Keshava Rangh Khalla submitting certified extract of Barabard for October 1895 etc —

Letter No 307/30-31 of 19.9.1931 from the Inam Commissioner furnishing information

The case was heard by the M. (Offg. Dewan) on 23-3-1931 — The information called for in the Minute of the First Member of Council paras 23 to 27 (pages 5 & 6 of the note) is furnished in the Inam Commissioner's report of 9.6.31 & in the D.O. letter of 9.9.31 (P. 4-a)

In the light of information furnished the case is for final orders —

(H. Secy)

7.10.31

Maybe posted if necessary

2-11-31

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

No. 2933

WD 02558—GPE—50,000—8 7 30

File No 91-193

General

378

App. F III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat | Mez | File No. | of 1931-32

Serial No.

Letter no. 454/30-31 dt 10.10.1931 from the Muzrai Commissioner Bellary a report on the petitions of messrs Keshava Raya Bhatta, N. Rangaswamiya and Shanta Raja Iyengar of Sri Ranganatha Swamy temple at Srirangapatana praying for restoration to their respective Sarkal grade Charges —

1) to 2nd The return of the Counsels file sent dt 6/10 is awaited & on its return this will be worked up & submitted

Ref No. 300 of 31-32 dtd 6/10

MSK 31/10

31.10.31

NOTE - Contn Sheet

WD 02555—50,000—GPB—8-7

50) The case was heard by the present Hon'ble Members of Council (the present Acg Governor) on 23.3.31. The M.C has submitted information on the points raised in paras 20 & 28 in his letter of 19.9.31. After the hearing of the case the same parties made representations personally on the same subject and a report was called for. This report has been received from the M.C. vide his letter of 10.10.31

51) As the report in paras 20-28 & annexure 47, it is for orders if the case has again to be posted for hearing or may be worked up & posted for orders in the usual course as the parties have already been heard fully and as complete information has since been received from the M.C.

19/11/31 52) Please ascertain from Mr. N.V. Sundaram the pleasure of the Member in the matter.

19.11.31

53) A This may be done

21/11

General and Revenue Secretariat — File No. 611 of 1930

Serial No.

Reference:- orders at para 23 sch deg.

54) Shanmu Raja Iyengar before revision was drawing the following allowances:—

		Rs
1	Swami Sannidhi Paichanthe	6-0-0
2	Alwar Sannidhi Paichanthe	2-8-0
3	Ramanuja Parayana	1-8-0
4.	Volagnai Venkatarangaswami Paichanthe —	1-4-11
	Total	11-4-1

55) As seen from paras 163 P. 4-W I, he has a hereditary right to the above posts, the first two of which were combined during the revision of 1922 with a pay of Rs 8/—. Raja Iyengar is holding the first two even now & drawing a revised allowance of Rs 8/- So far he can not be regarded as having lost anything in respect of these. The pay of the Combined post is Rs 8 as regards posts 3 & 4, they 56 got amalgamated during the revision with other appointments and are reported to have gone to others - Thereby the revision has effected the State to the Rs extent of 2-12-11-

Vide Sl No 11 H 3 of para 5 on file

63) This arrangement was necessary in the interests of the institution and can not be modified now

57) N. Ranganayaki Iyengar was before revision drawing the following allowances :—

		Rs
	Yaga sale Paichanthe	6-0-0
	Pillalgnai Sannidha	3-0-0
	Rajendravanadai Rajaswami Paichanthe	1-4-11
		10-4-11

NOTE—Contn Sheet

11 Item No 53.

WD 02553—50,000—GPB—8-7 30

iii

4)

Mez 3 File No. 64 of 1930-1 | General and Revenue Secretariat

Posts i & iii held by him are reported to be hereditary - The post marked iii was abolished during revision, its duties having been reported to have been allocated to others - Nevertheless he has been drawing Rs 8/- each against 7-6-11 due on the hereditary posts.

58 Item No ii which V. Rangaswami Iyengar is reported to be holding before revision was an ad-hoc appointment (Vide para 9 of the P.W.D) & he can not claim it as a matter of right. Hence he is not entitled to any benefit effected by the revision of 1922.

59) In view of these facts. This petitioner and has also no claim to any higher emoluments.

59) As regards the fees of Pampath Ammalachar. I do not see in the minutes of the meeting of council (Para 27) it is said that his request is dead / perhaps can be conceded (in this stage) The light of the report - Vide para 5 of Part I

65) Please note clearly what right this petitioner urges & the office and if it has any foundation. The M.C's letter is not clear

The P.W.D II is a report on The fees received from messrs Shanka Raja Iyengar & V Rangaswami Iyengar & Keshavaraya Khalasi Subsequent to the orders passed by this meeting. This may be read with the minutes in para 23 regarding minutes in para 23 regarding

G.S.M.R. 11/2

6890/13

Extract with respect to I Members minute dt 24.3.31 (para 23 & 25 thereof)

For Secy)

1st Member

4/3/32

5673.

23.3.32

Please see Marginal notes 5 - 1

24/3/32

File No. 64 of 1930-1

Serial No.

(6) As regards para 65, kind ref^ce is invited to para 2 of letter no 307/30-31 of 19.9.31 received from the M.C. It is reported therein that, after the death of Yadugiriyamma, the benamdar of Alwar Sannidhi Paicaranam, Rajangam her nephew (as seen from the records & above) succeeded to the particular Paicaram inam work. In this connection reference is invited to the Peshkar's report of 28/5/31 para III — which throws some light on the claim put forward by Sampathkumaracharlu the petitioner. The latter is said to be the son of one Shamanna son-in-law of Yadugiriyamma & who is referred to in the petition as the natta valme. In 1919 the S.D.O. is stated to have ordered that the benamdar may remain in the name of Yadugiriyamma until the succession dispute between her supposed son Shamanna, Purushothama Kuppanna & Rajagopala Sampathkumaracharlu & Rajagopala was settled in a civil court and succession certificate produced. The records are silent as to whether Sampathkumaracharlu ever tried to seek relief that way. Since Rajangam (prior to his death & Yadugiriyamma's after her death also) has been functioning as the particular Paicaram work which since 1922, the date of revision has been annu

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

Mis Appl 3 of 30-31
(Sri Ranganatha Sooriya Teertha Swamiar
Paricharike Dharmadhikari) of 1930 -

Mis File No. 69

General in Revenue Secretariat

+ Paricharike of Swami Samridhi (Item no 11 of the list issued with the G.O. of 1922)
In their [illegible] ages
[The petitioner's request does not appear to be tenable as seen from the fact that he took no actions directed by the D.W.O. [That Sampathkumaracharlu should try to seek relief without his case being tried by the D.C & the Madras High Court is not also permissible].

The above is subject to the orders in the Minutes in para 6 - Supra -

18 -

This Secy)

The C/P may bring up a person as soon as I return to H.Q. ps.

20/5/32

6/6/32

8/6/32

(1) I have nothing to add to what is contained in the note.

(Sd) Illegible for Member.

30/6/32

Orders may be issued according to my notes of 24.3.31 & 1.7.32 above

1.7.32

1/7/32

Issued

9/7/32

3 0 JUN 1932 No 8628

A separate endorsement may be given to him to say that he should submit his representation to Board Secy Commissioner in the first instance.

1.7.32

1/7/32

Personally called on 17/6/32 & received the following instructions = I have sent for the file & will reply in due course.

9.S 17/6

As I was not sent for the Secy & P.P.S. personally called the case to the H.S. on 21/6/32, & received the following orders :- & left the Lr. see over.

9.S 21/6

Called on 29/6/32 & received the following orders

Board to-morrow

9.S 29/6

11 JUL 1932 GENL & REVENUE SECT

Mrz Appl. per 3 of 30-31 21

General and Revenue Secretariat — Mrz File No. 64 of 193 (). [App. F. III—2

Serial No.	
9	No 125 of 18.7.32 to the Mrzra Commissioner Communicating the decision in the Case.
10	Memo no 126 of 18.7.32 to Keshava Rangh Bhatkar the applicant forwarding Copy of the decision in the Case.
11	Memo no 127 of 18.7.32 to Shanta Raja Hegde forwarding the Copy of decision in the Case
12	Memo No 128 of 18.7.32 to N. Rangaswamiengar Communicating the decision in the appeal
13	No 129 of 18/7/32 to Mr L. S. Raja Advocate Bangalore city Communicating the decision in the appeal case
14	No 130 of 18/7/32 to Shanta Sampath Hegde Sirsi Shamanna - Sringapatam — Informing them he should submit his representation to the local Mrzra authorities in the first instance

(2) 4/5

WD 70—GBPM—60,000—13-8-31





Muzrai 64-30-1

ಹುಬ್ಬಳ್ಳಿ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಒಳಗೆ ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟರ್ಡ್ ಸಿಲ್ಕ್ ಕಾಟನ್ ಸರವರಕ್ಕೆ ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಒಪ್ಪಂದ ಪತ್ರಗಳನ್ನು

ತ್ರಿರಂಗಪಟ್ಟಣದ ತ್ರಿರಂಗನಾಥಸ್ವಾಮಿಯವರ ದೇವಸ್ಥಾನದ ಪಂಚಾಯ್ತಿ ಶಿರಸ್ತೇದಾರಿಕೆ, ಮತ್ತು ಮುಕ್ತಿಮಂಟಪಗಳು ಗುಡಿ ಶಿರಸ್ತೇದಾರಿಕೆ, ಗರಾವದು ಕಿದಾರಿಕೆ ಮತ್ತು ಹೊರಸ್ಥಾನಾರ್ಥದ ಪಾಳೆಗಾರಿಕೆ ಮತ್ತು ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಮತ್ತು ಹಕ್ಕುಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ

ಮಹಾಸ್ವಾಮಿಯವರು ಶ್ರೀರಂಗಪಟ್ಟಣ ಶ್ರೀರಂಗನಾಥಸ್ವಾಮಿಯವರ ದೇವಸ್ಥಾನದ ಪಂಚಾಯ್ತಿ ಶಿರಸ್ತೇದಾರಿಕೆ ಗುಡಿ ಶಿರಸ್ತೇದಾರಿಕೆ ಮತ್ತು ಗರಾವದು ಕಿದಾರಿಕೆಯನ್ನು 1922ನೇ ಇಸವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಳೀಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧೀನ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡರು. ಈ ಹಕ್ಕುಗಳನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಗೆ ಬಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಡುವುದಾಗಿ 26-7-30ನೇ ಇಸವಿಯ 15/24-30 ನೇ ಗಂಗಾಧರಪ್ಪನವರು ಮತ್ತು ಸಂತಾನದವರು ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಒಪ್ಪಂದ ಪತ್ರದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕೆಲವು ಷರತ್ತುಗಳನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಮೇಲಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸ್ಥಳೀಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಮೇಲಿನ ಹಕ್ಕುಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರಜಾ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳ ಸಭೆಯವರಿಗೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಡಲು ಸಿದ್ಧರಿರುವುದಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಹಕ್ಕುಗಳನ್ನು 1922ನೇ ಇಸವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಳೀಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ಮತ್ತು 1925ನೇ ಇಸವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಸಿಲ್ಕ್ ಕಾಟನ್ ಸರವರಕ್ಕೆ ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ಮೇಲಿನ ಹಕ್ಕುಗಳನ್ನು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದವರಿಗೆ ಬಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಡಲು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದವರು ಸಿದ್ಧರಿರುವ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಜಾ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳ ಸಭೆಯವರಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಿ ಅವರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು

RC. 271

Ack 15/29-30

26/7/30



Record
Mrs Lee called
for -
Mark
4/8/30

IN THE COURT OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCILLOR, BANGALORE
(In charge of Muzrai Portfolio)

Appellants :-
Tamil Raju Iyengar
& Rangaswamy Iyengar
Seringapattam.

****

V.S

Opponent -
Sheanich Rangaswamy Iyengar
of Seringapatam

Appeal against the decision of the Muzrai Commissioner in Muzrai Appeal No. 15 of 1929 - 30.

I. We the appellants (1) Rajaiengar and (2) Rangaswamiengar beg to state as follows:-

(a) According to the G. O. No. 639-41/Muz. 379-21-2 dated 9th August 1922 sanctioning a revised scale of expenditure in Sree Rangenathaswami Temple at Seringapatam, it has been ordered that by a redistribution and judicious combination of offices, the number of servants has been reduced from 100 to 71, with a corresponding increase in average emoluments. The appellants beg to submit respectfully that the two Paricharikas have suffered in emoluments, to the extent of - - Rs 3-4-11 in respect of Rajaiengar and Rs 2-4-11 in the case of Rangaswamiengar as explained below:--

Before revision.			After revision.	
1. Rajaiengar.				
Item No.11	Paricharike Sreni Sannidhi.	6-0-0	Item No.11	Paricharike Sreni Sannidhi including her Paricharike Seri-pada.
,, 13	Paricharike Alwar Sannidhi and Seripada.	2-8-0		
,, 14	Upanishad Parayana	1-8-0		
,, 99	Olagudi Venkataramanaswami.	1-4-11		
		11-4-11		

27

Before revision.			After revision.	
2. N. Rangaswamiengar.				
Item No. 50	Yagasale Paricharike	6-0- C	Item No. 13 Yagasale aremane paricharike and Sripada.	8-0-0
,, 55	Suttulugudi & Sripada	3-0- 0		
,, 98	Gajendravarada pooje.	1-4-11		
		10-4-11		8-0-0

Thus it will be clearly seen that we the appellants Rajaiengar and N. Ranaswamiengar have lost in emoluments to the extent of Rs 3-4-11 and Rs 2-4-11 which we pray may be restored to us according to the wording in the Government Order.

II. Out of the 5 Parich riks 2 have been abolished according to the overnment Order sanctioning the revision and their dut were added on to the other 3 Parichariks and sthaniks. But ac to Suttulugudi Parich rike which belonged to us has been entir the was from us and given over to sthe il Rangaswamiengar instead of distributing them among us equally. The undermentio Sribhums have been given over to the sthanik mentioned abov

(1) Jayavijayaswami.
(2) Gopalakrishnaswami.
(3) Parthasaradevaru.
(4) Garudadevaru.
(5) Andalamma devaru.
(6) Ponnar rishnadevaru.
(7) Sattabhiramadevaru.
(8) Sadhasaradevaru, and
(9) Sweyambhuvalu Venkataramana.

Of the above items (1) and (2) belonged previously to appellan Rajagopalaiengar of which he possesses the Suk and may be restored, the rest but should be given over to the Sthanikas and the Parich riks.

III. According to the same Government Order sanctioning the revision, the appellant N. Rangaswamiengar who is the Yagasale Parich rike is ordered to keep open the temple at all hours of the day for convenience of pilgrim visitors but actually the directions in the Government Order have not been carried out

as ~~the~~ this appellant is not being given the key of the temple at all but kept by the Archak himself.

Under these circumstances, the appellants respectfully pray for-

(1) Restoration of emoluments according to old scale instead of the new one which reduces their emoluments.

(2) Equal distribution of Suthlugudi Paricharike between Sthaniks and Parichariks based upon Hukdari rights.

(3) Allowing the Yagasale Paricharik to retain the key of the temple to enable him to keep open the temple at old hours of the day in accordance with the instructions contained in the Government Order sanctioning the revision, just as the sthanik Rangaswamiengar. Opponent. has retained for himself the Puk of Sree Venkataramanaswami temple, so as the Deputy Commissioner has given us the bidugudi temples for which we possess the Puk.

Statements of distribution of wastes and allowances are herein enclosed for kind perusal.

(1) [illegible]

(2) [illegible]

APPELLANTS.

Bangalore,
4th August 1930.





Office of the Mussai Commissioner in Mysore. Bangalore

Mus: Appeal No. 15 of 29.30

Appellant
Shanik Ranga-swamiengar Sri

Vs.

Ranganathaswami temple, Seringapatam

Respondents
(1) Tanishna Bhatta since deceased by Sonamayakamma
(2) Narasipuram Rangaswamiengar
(3) Shanik Rajarunga
Residents of Seringapatam

Subject

Appeal against the order of the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore district re the distribution of Panichanike work of Suthalagudis in the Sri Ranganatha-swamy temple at Seringapatam.

Facts of the case

The revision of the scale of expenditure of the Sri Ranganathaswamy temple at Seringapatam was sanctioned in G.O. No. 639-41/ Mus: 379-21-22 dated 9th August 1922.

In pursuance of the Government order referred to above a Communication dated 10-8-22 was issued from the Mussai Superintendent to the Deputy Commissioner Mysore to the effect that the post of Suthalagudi Panichanike (item No. 14 in the revised scale of expenditure issued in the said Government order) might be conferred the appellant Shanik Rangaswamiengar in view of the archakship &c &c

which he had lost by virtue addition of the duties thereof to the archaks of the main shrine of Sri Ranganathaswami in the revised scale. An endunsement in the matter was issued to the appellant

Thereupon he put in a petition dated 19-7-23 to the taluk Office complaining that the Government order in question was not given effect to and therefore praying that he might be given charge of Suthalagudi Panicharike. On this, a report was called for from the Peshkar of the temple who submitted that if the Government order was given effect to, there would arise ill feeling among other ~~people~~ temple servants and that if the Suthalagudis and Bidagudis were divided among the four shanikes, the other servants that had been enjoying the Suthalagudi and Bidagudi Panicharikes would have to suffer and therefore the execution of the Government order was kept in abeyance. Then the Amildar issued an order dated 2-10-1924 to the Peshkar that the Government order should be immediately given effect to

The Peshkar again reported that, if the Government order would be carried out, there would be many practical difficulties. On this the Amildar ordered that at any cost the allocation of work sanctioned in the Government order

re Suthalagnadis and Bidagnadis Pari-charike should be enforced

Subsequently, the Amildar submitted a report dated 9-1-25 to the Sub Division Officer stating that as per the Government order two Stanikes should be given charge of Suthalagnadis and two other Sthanikes the Bidugnadis, that the archaks of Annamanavara Samidhi and the Panichanikes of Yaga Sale had stated that they were the rightful varawardars to the Suthalagnadis and Bidugnadis and that they refused to handover the charge. The Sub Division Officer passed an order dated 20-3-25 that the appointments re Suthalagnadis and Bidagnadis should be in accordance with the Government order.

On 19-7-25 a communication from the temple Peshkar was issued to the 2nd respondent N. Rangaswami Aiyar, directing that as per the Government order the Panicharike of all the Suthalagnadis and Bidagnadis of the Sri Ranganathaswamy temple should be distributed among the four Sthanikes, that the 1st respondent Krishna Bhatta should be in charge of the Sri Vedanta Desikar Samidhi and Annamanavara Samidhi and that the appellant should be in charge of four Suthalagnadis

petitions were presented to the Division Officer praying that the charge of the Suthalagnis should not be given to the appellant. A detailed enquiry was held in the matter and the Sub Division Officer passed the following order with special reference to the Government order in question.

1) That the three Suthalagnis Panicharike, viz (i) Arule Sri Lakshmi narasimhaswamy (ii) Sri Lakshmikanta-swamy & (iii) Vedantacharyara Sannidhi might be given to the 1st Respondent Krishna Bhatta as per the order of 25-1-1877 of the Ashtagrama Division Commissioner.

2) That the Panicharike of Uthalagnis viz (i) Gajendra Varada and (ii) Anjaneya, might be given to the 2nd Respondent N. Rangaswamiengar as per the order dated 6-12-1875 of the Mysore district Munsif Officer.

3) That the Suthalagnidi Panicharike viz Volagnidi Venkataramana swami might be given to the 3rd Respondent, Shanik Rajaiengar.

4) That for the Suthalagnis in question no cash payment was claimed but only rice emoluments were given.

On appeal the Deputy Commissioner Confirmed the order of the Sub Division Officer, observing

that the Government order in question does not clearly state how Cooked rice should be distributed in what quantities and to whom.

It is against this order the present appeal has been preferred to this office.

The case finally came up for hearing on 1.7.30 when it was heard

— " —

order ~~No~~. Appeal No 15/29-30
Dated 26-7-30

— " —

The new scale sanctioned by Government has been passed after consulting the several functionaries of the Temple and the Dharmadarsis and local officers. should not vary them on the groun that prior to the new scale some of the officials were entitled to some duties. All the duties have been combined and divided rateably so as to give higher total emoluments to each servant in the shape of cash and food. Considering the case the Temple functionaries cannot claim to get their post under the new scale and at the same time claim portions of what they were enjoying under the old scale which have gone to the share of others as is done in this case. The appellant is according to the sanctioned scale entitled to Cooked rice for all the Sathala -pradis equally with Sthanik No. 15 and no one else has any claim

gone behind the sanctioned scale awarded offices to the Respondents as per old scale to the detriment of the appellant and against the provisio in the new scale. Such an alteration can be sanctioned only by Govern-ment and local officers have no right to vary the scale in the manner they have done. Either the temple servants should accept the old scale in toto or the new scale. They cannot claim some things under the new scale & others as per old scale as the Respondents have done. Be-sides the new scale has been approved by Govern-ment and cannot be varied without Government orders The Government order should be given effect to

Sd/ G. D'Souza
Munsif Commissioner

Copy applied for by Rajaiengar on 28.7.30
Copy ready on 31-7-30.
Copy delivered on 31-7-30
No. of words 1030
Copying fees 1-6-0
Comparing fees 0-3-8
Copied by S Jayaramadas
Compared by Bhamidessa

Copy.
N. Lakshminarayana
Manager
Munsif Court's Office

Manager
Munsif Court's Office

D. Dకే, 245-22-23

శ్రీరంగపట్టణ దళాయిరూపవ మాళ్కీరం, రంగనా
థ్వామ్యంప్వంగారికి—

5-11-22రే వుల్కుంగల్లు నీప్వళదుంకొండ లచ్చి
ంపు మ్నళరాంగరిగలాంయ్కు—

ఈంగు మాంగి శ్రీరంగనాంథ మాళ్కీరంలు వరదరాజ
గవళ్ళ తరాంపే ఆగిరూప చక్కిర్ళప్తియుమ్ను ఓపుకరిగి
నివుకే శ్రీల్పుభంమ్ను మాంళ్ళరమగా మాళ్కీరం దేవకార్యానిదల
చెల్లాగవ్వరకే తిసే వదలాగి వందుపుత్తాయిపుతిళరి
చేతరిరే ంపు మ్నళరాంగరిగలాంయ్కు వందుపుత్తాయిపుతిళరి
వరిసి లలాంటి మాంగరిగలాంయ్కు

9-1-22రే వుల్కుం లచ్చుమలమ్మ వెంకట్ట
రంగప్పళ వరం డెతరుత్తే

చిరంజీవులు
తే॥ 24-11-22

ఇట్లు ఆశీస్సులతో
తాతగారు మాళ్కీరం రంగాచార్యులు
మేనత్త ఇందిరా(రంగనాథ్)
మరదలు(రంగనాథ్)

5-8-25 మాళ్కీరం రంగనాథ్ వుల్కుంగార్(రంగనాథ్)

ఇంట్లో వారికి
కార్తీక మాస శుభాకాంక్షలతో.
శ్రీరంగపట్టణం -
తే. 24-7-28

Letter No. 3011 Treasury - 64-30 dated

from the Financial Secretary to the Government of Seychelles, to the Temporary Commissioner, the Temporary received under the Temporary Commissioner's Receipt

No. 307 / 30-31 dt. 25-8-30, to the Deputy Commissioner, Seychelles District

---

I am directed to forward herewith for favour of report with the connected records Appeal Petitions dated 31-4-30 & 4-8-30 preferred by (1) Shaik Raja Segugar (2) M. Ramanathan Segugar of Seringapatam against the order passed by you in regard to the distribution of Pariahairs costs of Emoluments in the Sri Ramanathaswamy temple at Seringapatam and restoration of emoluments according to the old Scale.

Office of the Deputy Commissioner,
Seychelles District
Dated, Seychelles 14th August September 1930

No. H.7014
30
Encls

Reference

Copy of the above together with its enclosure is forwarded to the Sub Treasurer of Mahe Seychelles, for submission of a certified Connected with the case at an early date.

for Deputy Commissioner
Mahe Seychelles

R. 1277

2. 3364

Jr-314/30-31 Forwarded the Amildar, Dimapatnam for submission of the connected records at an early date.

Dimapatnam
Dt. 3/9/30

40

The 7th August

Rajakaryapravina
P.C. D'Souza., Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Amzrai Commissioner in Mysore, Bangalore.

I am directed to forward herewith for favour ofareport with the connected records appeal petitions dated 31-7-30 & 4-8-30 preferred by (i) Sthanik Raja Iyengar (ii) N. Ranga-swamy Iyengar of Srirangapatam against the order passed by you in regard to the distribution of Paricharike work of Suthlalgudis in the Sri Ranganatha swami temple at Sri-rangapatam and restoration of emoluments according to the old scale.

I have the honor tobe
Sir
Your most obedient servant,

V Subrahmanyasastri

For Financial Secretary to Government.

9s 7/8 Fair-dft.

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Section Mug.

File No. 64-30.

Serial No.

No. 306/R

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *192*

To

The Mug. Comm.

in Mysore

Date of issue 8/8/30

Signed by Mr. V. S. Sastri

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith for favour of report with the connected records, ~~one~~ 31.7.30 and appeal petitions dated 4.8.30 preferred by (i) Shamu Raja Iyengar (ii) V. Ranga Swamy Iyengar of Srirangapatam against the order passed by you in regard to the ~~the Emoluments of~~ distribution of Paricharike work of Suthalagudis in the Sri Ranganatha Swami temple at Srirangapatam & restoration of emoluments according to the old scale thereof etc.

List of enclosures .....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

WD 063—GPB—20,000—1 8-29

795—GPB—2000—13-11-27

ನಂಬರು ಎ.೧೬೫

ಇನ್ನುಮೇಲೆ ನೀವು ಬರೆಯುವ ಕಾಗದ ಪತ್ರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ನಂಬರನ್ನು ದಯಯಿಟ್ಟು ನಮೂದು ಮಾಡಿ.

..... ರ ಆಫೀಸು.

ತಾರೀಖು 193

ಇಂಡಾರ್ಸ್ಮೆಂಟ್.

..... ಗೆ.

ಸಂದರ್ಭ:— ನಿಮ್ಮ ..... ನೆಯ ಮಲ್ಕಂ ~~ಕಾಗದ~~ ~~ಅರ್ಜಿ~~

ವಿಷಯ:—

..... ಗೆ.

ಈ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಕಂಡ ..... ನೆಯ ನಂಬರ್ ಕಲಮಿಗೆ ಗಮನಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಕೋರಿದೆ.

ರುಜು .....

ಪುದ್ದೆಯ ಹೆಸರು .....

---

*

1. ನಿಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆಯನ್ನು ~~ನೆರವೇರಿಸಿ~~ ಕೊಡಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ; .....

2. ನಿಮ್ಮ ಕಾಗದವನ್ನು / ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ..... ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದೆ.

3. ಈ ಆಫೀಸಿನ ..... ನೆಯ ಮತ್ತು ..... ನೆಯ ನಂಬರಿಗೆ ಗಮನಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಕೋರಿದೆ.

4. ..... ನೆಯ ಮತ್ತು ..... ನೆಯ ನಂಬರನ್ನು ಕಂಡು ಹಿಡಿಯಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ; ಅದರ ಒಂದು ನಕಲನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು,

5. ಮಲಮೊಹರುಗಳು ತಲುಪಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

6. ಅರ್ಜಿಯು —

(i) ವಿಧಾಯಕವಾದ ನಮೂನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೆಯಲ್ಪಡದೆ,

ಅಥವಾ (ii) ಕ್ರಮವಾಗಿ ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಪು ಹಚ್ಚಿಸಲ್ಪಡದೆ,

ಅಥವಾ (iii) ವಿಧಾಯಕವಾದ ವಾಯಿದೆ ಯೊಳಗಾಗಿ ಹಾಜರ್ಮಾಡಲ್ಪಡದೆ,

ಅಥವಾ (iv) ಯಾವ ಹುಕುಮಿನ ಮೇಲೆ ಅಪೀಲು ಮಾಡಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿರುವುದೋ ಅಥವಾ ಪಿರ್ಯಾದು ತರಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿರುವುದೋ ಆ ಹುಕುಮಿನ ಒಂದು ನಕಲಿನ ಸಮೇತ ಕಳುಹಿಸಲ್ಪಡದೆ, ಇರುವ ಪ್ರಯುಕ್ತ, ಅದನ್ನು ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ವಾಪಸುಮಾಡಿದೆ.

7. ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ..... ರಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಜರ್ಮಾಡುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವಾಪಸುಮಾಡಿದೆ.

8. (a) ಅರ್ಜಿಯ ಬರೆವಣಿಗೆಯು ಓದುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಾರದಹಾಗೆ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ,

(b) ಅರ್ಜಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದಿಸಿರುವ ವಿಷಯವು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿಲ್ಲದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ,

(c) ಅರ್ಜಿಯು ಅನುಚಿತವಾದ ಭಾಷೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೆಯಲ್ಪಟ್ಟು ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅದನ್ನು ವಾಪಸು ಮಾಡಿದ.

* ಕಾರಣಗಳು ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಇದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವನ್ನು ಸಂಕ್ಷೇಪವಾಗಿ ನಮೂದಿಸತಕ್ಕದ್ದು.

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE

Bangalore, 16th October 193
72.

Muz 64-30-3

No. 307 ~~30-31~~ 20/1/27 file

FROM

S. P. Rajagopalachâri, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
~~Rajakaryapraveena~~
~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~

Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

+ rec'd receipt 25-10-30

To

Rajasevaparayana
P. Srinivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
Financial Department.

(243)

SIR,

With reference to your letter No.304 Muz.64-30 dated 6-8-30, forwarding for report together with the connected records the Appeal Petitions of (1) Stanik Raja Iyengar (2) N. Rangaswamy Iyengar of Seringapatam against the order of this office in regard to the distribution of Paricharike work of Suthlalgudis in the Sri Ranganathaswamy temple at the place, I have the honor to forward herewith the entire records connected with the case received with the Mysore District Deputy Commissioner's letter No.H.204/30 dated 4-10-30 (copy enclosed) together with this office file App. No.15/29-30 dated 26-7-30, and to state that the facts of the case are fully set forth in this office file referred to above. The enclosures received with your letter are retransmitted herewith.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

S P Rajagopalachari

Muzrai Commissioner.

AM/

Letter No. H.204/30 dated 4-10-30 from the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

Distribution of Paricharika work, Sri Ranganathaswamy temple, Seringapat Appeal.

With reference to your Memo No.307/30-31 dated 25-8-30, I have the honor submit herewith the file of records relating to the distribution of parichara work of Suthalagudis in the Sri Ranganathaswamy Temple at Seringapatam and to state that the facts of the case are set forth in your order Appl. No.15/29-3 dated 26-7-30.

The petition with its enclosures received with your Memo are retransmitte herewith.

"COPY"

For Muzrai Commissione

IX F G—1

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193* .

Date of issue.....

Signed by..... In charge of the rec. Sultanagoi Panchayath

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

Section

File No.

Serial No.

No. 1285

To

Sri Stanik Rangaswamieyar
Sri Ranganathaswamy Temple-Srirangam

is informed that the Munsiff appeal petn. 3 of 30-3 of Stanik Raja Nagaswamieyar and Narasimhan Rangaswamieyar against the order of the Munsif Court in appeal no 15 of 29-30 on his file is posted for hearing before the 1st Additional Court on Sunday 13th Dec 30 at 2.30 pm. in the office Public Offices, Bza

over

5.12

WD 02559—GPB—25,000—25-6-30

Before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja

of Mysore, Bangalore

In the Court of the

Muz. Appeal No. 3 OF 1930—1931.

Petitioners.:— Opponent.
~~Appellants, Plaintiff.~~ ~~Respondent, Defendant.~~

Mysore
Hm
15/12/30

Sthanik Rajlengar and Narasipura Rangaswami Iyengar. } Vs. { Sthanik Rangaswami Iyengar.

1. I the Opponent above named do by these presents retain Mr. L. S. RAJU, M.A., (HONS.) B.L., Advocate, Lakshmi Sthanam, Kasivisveswara Temple Lane, Bangalore City, to appear in and conduct the above case on my behalf to judgment.

2. I further empower him to execute any decree or order that may be passed in my behalf and to receive from Court such sums of money as I may be entitled to get and to grant receipts therefor.

3. I also undertake to confirm and ratify all the legal acts done by the said Advocate in so doing.

+ [illegible]

Accepted

Lakshmi's
15/12/30.
Advocate for

Signed before me and personally known to me.

Lakshmi's.
Advocate.

15/12/30

B. S IYENGAR, PRINTER, B CITY

1919 468 23/9/30

Mus 151 30-

In the Court of the Member in charge of Inam Port Folio in Mysore, Bangalore 64-30-2

Appellant:-

Krishnabhatta, since deceased by Somanayakamma, represented by her nephew, Keshavarangabhatta, residing in Seringapatam.

Vs

Respondent:-

Srinivasa Ragavendra Iyengar, Seringapatam.

This is an appeal against the decision of the Inam Commissioner in Mysore passed on 26th July 1930 in appeal No.15/29-30. The appellant beg to submit as follows:-

1. This appellant has been the paricharak of the undermentioned three sutlagudies:-

1. Sree Lakshminarayanaswamy
2. Sree Lakshmikanthaswamy
3. Vedanthachar Sannadhi.

and has been in possession of the mukh through for the last 54 years. The order as well as the endorsement of Colonel --- A.C.Hayes, Commissioner of Ashtagram Division, passed on 25th January 1877, according to which the said mukh has been --- confirmed may kindly be perused in this connection. But for the last three months as per the Inam Commissioner's order of 26th July 1930 this appellant has been deprived of the Paricharika of these three sutlagudies although he is the Mukhdar of the same.

The Government order of August 1922 stood in the way of the 5 Paricharaks two have been abolished but their duties devolved on to the other three Parichariks and others.

What has been taken place actually is that out of 32 sutlagudies 22 have been given over to each of --- Ramanujam Iyengar and no result of distribution is humbly submitted the appellant having had the

the three Suthlugudies mentioned may be permitted to have the Paricharaks by virtue of his Hukh for which the original records will be ~~are herewith~~ produced. if called for.

It is further submitted that Government Order of August 1922 ~~xxx~~ does not contemplate deprivation of existing hukh nor does it state almost all the Suthlagudies should be given over to one Sthanick Rangasami Iyengar. It is further submitted that this Sthanick Rangasami Iyengar was not the Hukhdar of any in the ---- Temple of Sri Ranganathaswami at Seringapatam from 1915 to 1922 and also at the time of the Government Order 1922 was passed and it is not known how he has been put in possession of almost all the Suthelugudies at the cost of livelihood of the other hukhdars. The Parichearika of Vedanthachar Sannidhi was not even given to the said Ran asami Iyengar in the year 1925 when the scale of 1922 was given effect to. Now this Paricharika also was claimed by him and given by the influence of the Local Officers.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the Paricharika of the three Suthlugudies viz., Lakshminarasimha Swami, Lakshmikanth Swami and Vedanthachar Sannidhi may kindly be restored to the --- undersigned appellent as ordered by the Sub Divisional Officer. Krishnarajanagar and the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District.

All the connected records have been produced to the Office of the Huzrat Commissioner on 2nd July 1930 at the time of hearing by the appellent which may kindly be called for and perused in this connection.

ಇಂತಿ ವಿಶ್ವಾಸಿಯವನು

Bangalore,
19th Sept. 1930.

SUBJECT..... 45

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

Section Mwz

File No. 151 – 30 64-30

Serial No. 4

No. 707

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 193

To

Endt: granted to Mr.

Kesavaraya Bhattar of Seevayapatam.

Date of issue 24-10-30

Signed by Mr. V.S Sastry

With reference to his petition dated 19.9.30 appealing against the ~~his~~ order of the Mirasi Commissioner depriving him regarding the ~~of the~~ Parucherike of the three Sattada Sudies of (1) Sree Lakshminarayana Swamy (2) Sree Lakshmikanta Swamy and Vedanthacher Sannidhi, Mr. Kesava. raya bhattar is directed for free a Copy of the ~~this~~ order passed 26-7-1930 appealed against. ~~to in the petition~~

By

[over.

for Head

3.10.30 – 4 P.M.

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

WD02559—GPB—25,000—25 6-30

GENL & REV
781
MUZRAI.

27.11.30

The Secretary to Government
Law department Bangalore.

Muz 64 30-5

Sir,

With reference to your endorsement No. 907/ Muz. 151-30-2 dated the 23/24th October 1930, I beg to state, when I applied for a copy of the order from the Muzrai Commissioner passed on 26th July 1930, in re the paricharika of the Three Sathalagudies attached to Sri Rangalatha Swamy Temple at Seringapatam, it has been ordered "That the file connected therewith has been submitted to Government and as such copy applied for cannot be granted." The file in question, it appears has been submitted to Government on the appeal filed by ~~one~~ Raja Iyengar & Rangaswamy Iyengar.

Under the circumstances I request that a copy of the order mentioned above may kindly be ordered, if necessary to be produced by me, from the records available in the Government now to be issued. I am prepared to produce necessary copying charges for the same on ~~hearing the~~ receipt of the intimation.

Endorsement given by the Muzrai Commissioner on my copy application is herewith submitted for kind perusal I therefore pray early orders on the same.

I beg to remain
Sir
your most obedt. Servt.
ಕೆ.ಸಿ.ಪಿ.ಎಸ್.ಅಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್

Bangalore,
27th November 1930.

Revenue Collector
Kovvuru
with Rs 2/- & 2 sheets
Comp
26/11

Subd
The Concerned record
is said to have been
sent up to Govt.
as such attendance
is not connected with
Land Revenue Matters
there be refunded
will the fee
26/11

26/11/30

Rev
26/11/30

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF [illegible] MYSORE AT BANGALORE.

Muzrai Appeal No. 3 of 30/31

Stharick [illegible], [illegible] leigur, of [illegible]		Appellant
	- VS -	
[illegible]		Respondent.

Petitioner.

Sthanil [illegible] thum [illegible] case, son of [illegible] residing at [illegible]. ~~Now [illegible]~~.

The petitioner above named [illegible] to state and pray as follows:-

1\. That I [illegible] appellant [illegible] -- filed [illegible] 1 on the file of this Hon'ble Court against the order of the [illegible] of [illegible] declared for the 1st time [illegible] ~~[illegible]~~ emolument of [illegible].2-0-0, belonging to [illegible] of [illegible] No.13 be granted to me.

2\. The petitioner [illegible] petitioner [illegible]

3\. [illegible] After [illegible] about 13 years [illegible] Kuo [illegible] contested [illegible] in petition [illegible] then [illegible] of the [illegible].C. on his order [illegible]

enquiry in a proper manner giving each party an opportunity to adduce his evidence.

4. That subsequently the petitioner's father - having died in the course of the enquiry the learned Sub D.O. ordered that the parties may establish their rights in a civil Court.

5. That in the meanwhile this appellant taking advantage of the provisional arrangements made some - years ago under which he was asked temporarily to - look after the duties of this office along with his own has a claim for the very suit before this Hon'ble Court.

6. That the respondent is willing to renounce his claim to the said huk of Sarichoritke of Alwar - Tirumudi in favour of the petitioner.

7. That therefore the petitioner respectfully prays this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to bring this petitioner on record either as a respondent or an -- appellant and effectively adjudicate on the matters in dispute.

8. That for a full and final adjudication of- the matters in dispute it is very necessary and expedient in the interest of justice to bring the -- petitioner on record.

N. Keshavaiengar
for ptr
23 3 31

Petitioner.

I, the petitioner above named do hereby declare that what is stated above is true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

GALORE
Dated. 23-3-31

Petitioner.

Before the Government of His Highness the ~~ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ~~
Maharaja of Mysore at Bangalore.

1930-31 ನೇ ನಂಬರು.

ವಾದಿ ಯಾ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ್ ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ ಯಾ ಅಪ್ಪೋನೆಂಟ್

Shanik Rajeevgas V.S. Shanik Ramasangappa

Petitioner:- Shanik Sangathamanachar

ಮು॥ ರಾ॥ [illegible]

ಅ.ದಿ.ರಾ.ರ ಬರಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಕಾಲತ್ ನಾಮ

ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ನನ್ನ ವರವಾಗಿ ಆಖೈರುವರುವಿಗೂ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿವಾದ ಜರಗಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೂ, ನನ್ನ ವರ ಆಗುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಧವಾದ ಆರ್ಡರನ್ನೂ, ಡಿಕ್ರಿಯನ್ನೂ, ಜಾರಿಕ್ರಮ ನಡಿಸಿ ಹಣ ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ನನಗೆ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ಸಲ್ಲಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವ ಡಿಕ್ರಿ ಮೊಬಲಗು, ಶಿಲ್ಕು ಮೊಬಲಗು ಸಹ ವಡಿಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ, ದಸ್ತೈವಜು, ವಗೈರೆಗಳನ್ನು ವಾವಸು ವಡೆಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ ಸಹ ತಮಗೆ ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ತಾವಾಗಲಿ ಯಾ ತಮಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಮತ್ಯಾವ ಲಾಯರಾಗಲಿ ಡಿಟೋ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡಿಸುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ಖುದ್ದು ಇದ್ದು ನಡಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಬದ್ಧನಾಗಿ ಇದೇನೆ.

ತಾರೀಖು 21/3/31 ರುಜು [illegible]

ಈ ಮೋಖ್ತ್ಯಾರುನಾಮಾ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಗೆ ವರಿಚಯಸ್ತರಾಗಿ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮ ರುಜುಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಈ ಮೊಖ್ತ್ಯಾರುನಾಮ ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿ ಇದೇನೆ.

V Keshavamurthy

ಸಿಕ್ಕುವ ಸ್ಥಳ:—ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಿಟಿ ಚಿಕ್ಕಪೇಟೆ " ವಿದ್ಯಾವಿಲಾಸ ಬುಕ್‌ಡಿಪೋ " ಯವರಲ್ಲಿ ದೊರೆಯುತ್ತೆ.

2374/

Enc Records

Date 30.4.51

Orgs 64-30-4 6.

To

The Muz. Commr.

Sir,

With reference to the appeal preferred by Sthanik Raja Iyengar and Narasipur Rangaswamiengar of the Sri Ranganathaswami temple Seringapatam, I am directed to request you to be so good as to furnish information on the following points:-

Sthanik Raja Iyengar has represented that he was originally in receipt of the following four allowances:-

Rs.	6- 0- 0		
"	2- 8- 0		
"	1- 8- 0		
"	1- 4-11	Rs	11-4-11

He has also stated that as against Rs. 11-4-11 he was receiving, his remuneration per mensem under the revised scale is only Rs. 8/-. I am to enquire if his claim to all the four allowances above mentioned was based upon hereditary right and if he had no hereditary claim to all of them, which of the items are established hereditary claims.

Narasipur Rangaswamiengar has represented that he was receiving prior to the introduction of the new scale the marginally noted items. He has stated that as against Rs. 10-4-11 his former emolument, his present emolument under the revised scale is only Rs. 8/-. I am to enquire if he had hereditary claim to all the three allowances which of the allowances he had hereditary

Rs. 6- 0-0
1- 4-11
3- 0- 0
Rs 10-4-11

right if not to all. Whether each of the above claimants is getting only Rs. 8/- in the revised scale as stated by them and against what posts may also be ascertained and reported.

I am also to forward herewith a petition presented in the course of the hearing on 23-3-1931 by Mr. N. Kesava Iyengar, Advocate on behalf of the Sthanik Sampathkumarachar for submission of a report on the representation made therein.

The entire records received with your letter No. 307/30-31 dated 23-10-1930 are herewith returned for reference and retransmission at an early date with a detailed report.

I have &c.,

4.4.31 for Finl. Secy. to Govt.
a.s.

11/4/31


COURT FEE
TWELVE ANNAS


11 APR. 1931
No. M.129


13 1931
1342

ಬಕಾಯಿದುರ್ಬಾರ ನ್ನೆವುಕ್ತೆಹಕ್ಕಿಪಾರರನ್ನೆಕೇ
ಳುವಳ್ಳಿಅಪ್ಪಣೆಕೊಡ್ಕಿದಂತೆವಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡೆರು

ಆಕ್ಟಾಟ್ತೆನಿವಾಸಾಂಚಾರಪೆರವರಶೇಲ್ಮೊಂ
ಡಿದಾಗ್ನೆ ಅವೆರವೆರನುಕ್ತೆಲಗುಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ಅವೆರವ
ರಹಷ್ಕಿನಲ್ಲೆಂಯಿಟ್ಟು ಅದಕ್ಕೆಗ ಇಬ್ಬಿಯುಷುಲಿತೆಲು
ನ್ನೆಲಕಾಯಿದುರ್ಬತೆಲಲಿಗೆನೇರ್ನಿ ಇರುಕ್ತಾಳೆನ್ನೆಲ್
ಪಕಾಂಪರಿನೆಲಹೂಡು ವೆಂಕ್ತೆ ಪ್ರೆಸನ್ನೆಕೈಷ್ಕೊಂಡಾ
ಪೋಪೆಕಾಗಿಚಿಚಿತೆಲಲು ಇಕ್ತೆ ಅದನ್ನಚೇರ್ಪ್ಪಯೀ
ನವಂಬೇತೆಲಲನ್ನಾಗಿವೂಡಿಶುಕ್ತಾರೆಲ್ಲಾದಳಿನಮ್ಮ
ತೆಲ್ಲುಕ್ಕೆನೇರಿದನುಕ್ತೆಲುಗುಡಿಗಳನ್ನೆಂಯಿತೆರಂಗಿ
ಕೂಡಚೇಲಂತಿಪ್ಪೆಲ್ಪ್ರನಿಡಿಂಪ್ಪಿನವೆಪ್ಪೆಆಗಅಲಾದ್ಧ

ಬಾಯಿಕಾಯಿದುರ್ತೆಲಲುದವಲೂದಿನಿಲ್ಲುಕ್ಕೆಳಿದ
ಪ್ಲೂಗಳಷ್ಕರಾಜ್ಞಪನವಲೂದಿನಿರುಪ್ಪೆದಿಲ್ಲಿಆದ್ದರಿಂ
ದತೀಲಆಕ್ಟಾಟ್ತೆನಿವಾಸಾಂಚಾರಪೆರುಂಬೂವರಿತೆ
ಇಪ್ಪಿದ್ದತೂ ಅದರಂತೆಂಯಿಲ್ಲಗಲೂಸುಕ್ತೆಲುಗುಡಿಗ
ಳನ್ನೆಂಯಿಟ್ಟಿರುಕ್ತಾರೆ-

ಯಿಲಪ್ಪಾನಿಕಂತಂಗಾಮಿಲ್ಯೆಂರುಪ್ಪೆಂಗಾರಿಗೆ
ವಂದುಸುಕ್ತೆಲುಗುಡಿಕೂಡಚೇಲಂತೆಯಿರುಕ್ತೆದೆ
ಯಿಲೇಪತಂತೆರುನಮ್ಮೆಳ್ಳಯಿಲ್ಲಾಸುಕ್ತೆಲುಗುಡಿಗ
ಳನ್ನಿತ್ತೆಇಒಪ್ಪುಕ್ತೆಲುಗುಡಿಗಳನ್ನೆಕೂಡಚೇಲಂ
ತಂಪಲೂವಆಡೆರುಆಗಲ್ಪೆವೆಂತೆಖಂತೂಕ್ತೆವಾಗಿ
ವಲ್ಲಕ್ತಿಪಡುಕ್ತೆರಿಕಾಡುಪರಾಂಪರಿನೆಲುಕುದು
ನಮುಗೆಹಿಂದೆಇದೆಂತೆಲುನವಿಕಾರಪ್ಪೆಲ್ಲಿವಾಂ

ಈ ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಉಲ್ಲೇಖಿಸಿರುವ ಪಟ್ಟಾಭಿಷೇಕ ಮಹೋತ್ಸವವು ಕ್ರಿ.ಶ. 1901 ಇನ್ನಿಜನವರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದುದು. 1922ನೆ ಇಸ್ವಿಯ ಕ್ಷ್ಯಾಂಬರ್ ಮಾಹೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಣಿಸಿದೆ. ಜನನ ಕಾಲವು 25-1-1877 ಇಸ್ವಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದು ಮುಗಿಯುವ ಕೈಲು ಸುಮಾರು ಇಳಿವಯಸ್ಸಿನವರಾಗಿದ್ದರು ಮತ್ತು ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಶವದರ್ಶನಾಂತರ ಸಂಸ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುವಂತೆ ಸಂಸ್ಕಾರವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಸಿದರು. ಇವುಗಳನ್ನು ಅರ್ಥಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಸಹಕರಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಅಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅನೇಕ ಸಲ ನಮಸ್ಕಾರಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಆಶೀರ್ವಾದಗಳು ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂತೋಷವನ್ನು ಹೊಂದುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಸ್ವಾಮಿ—

ಪರಮಪದಯೋಳು ಎಂಬ ಮಹಾಸ್ವಾಮಿಯವರು ಕಾಡುಮರಾಂಪರಿಕೆಯಿಂದಾ ನಮ್ಮ ವಂಶದಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದುಬಂದಿರುತ್ತೆ. ಇದ್ದು ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಗೂ ಮರ್ಯಾದೆಗಳನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಬರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಆಜ್ಞೆ ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತೆ. ಇಂತಿ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ—

ಕೇಶವ ವರ್ಮಣಃ ಪುತ್ರಃ

ಸ್ವಾಮಿಕಾರ್ಯಂ ಸ್ವಕಾರ್ಯಂ ಚ ಎಂಬ ಸೂತ್ರಾನುಸಾರವಾಗಿ ನಮ್ಮ ವಂಶದ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಬರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಆಜ್ಞೆ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಇಂದಿನವರೆಗೂ ಅನುಸರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಬರುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂತೋಷವನ್ನು ಹೊಂದುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಎಂಬ ಪದಕ್ಕೂ ತಕ್ಕಂತೆ ನಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ— ಕೇಶವ ವರ್ಮಣಃ ಪುತ್ರಃ

10-4-1931

Divisional SEAL Court.

F. No. 916.

From

The Office of the Divisional Commissioner,

Ashtagram Division.

To

The Petitioner Sesha Bhatta,

Sree Ranganayaki Sannidhi,

Sree Ranganatha's Temple,

Sreerangapatam.

Endorsement.

With reference to your appeal application re:--the Paricharike appointment of three Temples including Moole Narasimha Swami etc., in the Main Temple of Sree Ranganatha Swami, stating that you are serving in the said appointment since it was obtained by mortgage from its lawfull owner one Seshamma wife of one Sreenivasa Iyengar during the year 1874 and that you are unjustly expelled of your appointment by Mr. Sreenivas Rao, the present Muzrai Officer etc., along with his order :-- Your application has been registered in this office as No 688 and your case has been deeply considered after obtaining all the previous records connected therewith.

You have been in the said appointment from 1874 during which Mr. Krishna Moorthy then the Muzrai Officer has confirmed its Baravard to you after proper procedure on the application of Baravaerdar Seshama, whom has mentioned in it that she cannot work herself in the appointment as a female for the reason of which the Baravard should be transferred in your favour.

Order:--Under the above circumstances (Rupakari) order has been sent to the Deputy Commissioner to the effect that Mr. Sreenivasa Rao the Muzrai Officer is not justified in cancelling the order passed by Mr. Krishna Moorthy the Previous Muzrai Officer.

(Sd.) A.C. Hay.
Commissioner,
Ashtagram Division.

Camp. Chennarayapatam.
Dated 25th June 1877.

క్రమ సంఖ్య	పట్టాదారు పేరు	అనుభవదారు పేరు	సర్వే నెం.	విస్తీర్ణం ఎకరాలు	విస్తీర్ణం గుంటలు	కౌలు మొత్తం రూ.	కౌలు వసూలు చేసిన తేదీ
11	తిరుపతి వెంకటేశ్వర దేవస్థానం	కొత్తపల్లి వెంకటరామయ్య	7	-	-	9	24-11-22
90	తిరుపతి వెంకటేశ్వర దేవస్థానం	కొత్తపల్లి వెంకటరామయ్య	2	108		2	24-11-22

25-3-31 నాటికి పైన పేర్కొన్న కౌలు మొత్తం వసూలు చేయబడినది.

30/3/31

రెవెన్యూ అధికారి

రెవెన్యూ అధికారి

రు. 2-4-31

రు. 0-3-0

రు. 0-9-0

రెవెన్యూ అధికారి



11			5							
			4	9			9	8-2-1901		
2				108	2	108	2	108	8-2-1901	

	25-3-31
	30-3-31
	2-4-31
	0-3-0
	0-0-6½

Mr. Narasimhamurthy
clerk
30/3/31

శ్రీరంగపట్టణ తాలూకా స్థాయి చేవకవర్గీయ పత్తులు
మరియు వ్యవసాయ కిలకిల్లుత వివాదమును పరిష్కరించుటకు
మైసూర్ రాజ్ పేపర్ టెక్ మిల్స్ నౌకరుల వారు ఆఫీసునందు
నిర్వహించుకొనుటకు అనుమతి కోరుతూ వారు 24-11-22వ తేదీన
సంతకము చేసి ఇచ్చిన విజ్ఞప్తి ఆధారంగా ఆఫీసునందు
నిర్వహించుకొనుటకు అనుమతి ఇవ్వడమైనది. అయితే
18-6-24 తేదీన ఆర్డర్ కాపీ ప్రతిధ్వని చేయబడినది
ఆర్డర్ ఇలా ఉంటుంది —

టి. డి. నెం. 245/22-23

మైసూరు శ్రీ మంత్రి మండలి కార్యదర్శి వారి ఆఫీసునందు
నిర్వహించుకొనుటకు అనుమతి కోరుతూ 5-11-22నాడు
వ్రాసిన లేఖ ఆధారంగా ఆర్డర్ ఇవ్వబడుతుంది —

పైన తెలిపిన శ్రీరంగపట్టణ తాలూకా స్థాయి చేవకవర్గీయ
పత్తులు మరియు వ్యవసాయ కిలకిల్లుత వివాదమును
పరిష్కరించుటకు 9-1-23వ తేదీన ఆర్డర్ మూల పోచి
వ్యవస్థాపన చేయబడుతుంది

ఇట్లు
తా 24-11-22

ఇంటిలోనున్న ఈ వ్యవస్థ మూలపోచి వ్యవస్థాపన
ర్ మైసూర్ (సంతకము)



ನಂ. 128 1931

ಶ್ರೀ ಹುಜೂರ್ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿ ಮುಜರಾಯಿ । ಮಂದಸೆ ಕ್ರೆ [illegible]

ಹುಜೂರ್ ಮಹಾ ಸನ್ನಿಧಾನಂಗಳಿಗೆ — 13 1361

ಶ್ರೀರಂಗಪಟ್ಟಣದ ಶ್ರೀರಂಗನಾಥಸ್ವಾಮಿಯವರ ದೇವಸ್ಥಾನದ ಸನ್ನಿಧಿ ಪರಿಚಾರಿಕೆ ವಗೈರೆ ಹಕ್ಕುಗಳು ದಿ. ಪರಿಚಾರಿಕೆ ರಾಮ[illegible]ಂಗಾರ್ ಹಕ್ಕುದಾರನಾದ ತಿಂ. ರಾಘವಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್ ಬರೆದುಕೊಂಡ ಅರಿಕೆ ಮಹಾಸ್ವಾಮಿ—

ತಾ 23-3-31 ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನ ದಿವ್ಯ ಸನ್ನಿಧಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಕ್ಕುಗಳ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನನ್ನ ವ್ಯವಹಾರಗಳು ಹಕ್ಕುದಾರಿಯು. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ [illegible] ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನ ಮೂಲಕ ಕೊಡಲ್ಪಟ್ಟ [illegible] ನನ್ನ ವ್ಯವಹಾರಗಳು ಹಕ್ಕುದಾರಿ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ [illegible] ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಕೋರ್ಟ್ [illegible] 422/12-8-903 ನೇ ನಂಬರು [illegible] ಅಪೀಲ್ [illegible] ವ್ಯವಹಾರಗಳು [illegible] ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ [illegible] ಶ್ರೀರಂಗಪಟ್ಟಣ [illegible] ಸನ್ನಿಧಾನಕ್ಕೆ [illegible] ಮಹಾಸ್ವಾಮಿಯವರ [illegible] ಹಕ್ಕುದಾರರುಗಳು [illegible] ಸನ್ನಿಧಾನದ [illegible] ಕಾಗದಗಳು ಹುಕ್ಕುಗಳು [illegible]

[illegible] ಮಹಾಸ್ವಾಮಿ — 10. 4. 31.

[illegible signature]



No M.140

CIVIL 14 MAY 1931

28-4-31

App. F. G. 9]

GOVT. OF H. H. THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

No. 2406 Gen. & Rev. 6. 5-31.

The accompanying Petition Registered 28/4/31
No. 1455 dated 10.4.31
received at the General and Revenue Secretariat from Messrs Keshavaraya Bhatta, Shama Raja Vejuppa & Dr. Ramakrishnayya respectively of the Sri Ramanatha Swami Temple, Sringapatna praying that they may be restored to their Suttalgudi charges

is forwarded, together with ~~its~~ enclosures to the M-S.
for submission of a ~~Report~~ Report on the case of the Petitioners

By Order,
1. 5. 31
Secretary.

BANGALORE,
1/5/19 31

[P. T. O.

WD 02048 -GPB—3750—8-8-28

ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ್..... ....ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು

.....ಹೋಬಳಿ

....ಗ್ರಾಮದಲ್ಲಿರುವ

.....ಗೆ

ಇಂಡಾರ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡುವ

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನೀವು ಗುಜರಾಯಿಸಿಕೊಂಡ .....

ಮುಂದಿನ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು.. ....ಬಗ್ಗೆ

....

....ರವರ ಬಳಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದೆ

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು.

By Order,

Secretary.

Received in the Respondents





Before The Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore Bangalore.

Muzrai Department

Muzrai Appeal No 3/1930-31.

Appellants

Rajaiengar and others

Vs

Respondent

Rangaswamiengar

Memo for the Respondent

The Respondent begs to file herewith the following certified Copies in proof of the facts mentioned against them:—

1) Copy of Acquittance Roll for February 1931 — proves that Appellant Kesavaranga Bhatta has five Archakaships in Seringapatam alone Carrying Rs 44 per mensem. He is also Archaka of Krishnaswami for 1-8-0

2) Statement of 21-12-24 by Garudachar — disproves that Appellant Rajaiengar's right is hereditary

3) Acquittance Roll for April 1900 re Yagasala Paricharike — Proves that the Rightful owner was one of Vangipuram Narasimhachar to whom Appellant N. Rangaswamiengar is not at all related.

4) Acquittance Roll for 1895 — proves that Paricharike belongs to Sri Rangam Parasimhachar and Sannidhi Paricharike to Chokkannaiengar - Appellant Rajaiengar had never any right. Chokkannaiengar has his own heirs & successors.

5) References proving the Barawards of Respondent Rangasamiengar

(a) Acquittance Roll for April 1911 - proves that he had Prasanna Venkataramanaswami Archakaship carrying Rs 4-5-11 and Gograsa Rs 1-15-9 per mensem respectively

(b) Acquittance Roll for April 1911. proves that Respondent was also getting Rs 1-10-2 as Paditkara per mensem.

(c) Scale copy as per Muzrai dept reference dated 28.4.1900. proves that Respondent had the right of Rs 0-8-0 per mensem for Suthalasudi Paricharike

6) Scale copy of Muzrai dept for 28/4/900. proves that 14 Thanikaship (old scale) was vacant - As Respondent lost Prasanna Venkataramanaswami Archakaship, this was conferred on him along with Sannidhi Paricharike of Prasanna Venkataramanaswami

Respondent

V Sitaramaiengar
for Mr L S Raju
Advocate for Respondent
6/7/31



శ్రీరంగశర్మదగ్గిరుంచి వచ్చిన రాయబారం సంగతులు
9/6/31 లాస్ట్ ఉత్తరం నం. $\frac{68}{30-31}$ గా నంబరు అజ్ఞాపించిన
లేఖయుంత్రాత్రలిఖిత మిది – రాంభొట్లాచార్లు, శ్రీరంగశర్మ

శ్రీరంగశర్మకాంట్లాడు లాపులో సిర్రి వరభొట్లనరసిమ్మ
21గా డిసెంబరు 1894 గా ఇచ్చిన

శ్రీరంగశర్మదగ్గిరుంచి శ్రీ వేల్లో
వెళ్ళిపోడ్డాగరుకాంచాంత్రకమగదు
మంరు 22 వరుషవయసు నిసగరుకాం
చాంత్రు బరిచువుచు

శ్రీరంగశర్మదశీరంగశాస్త్రి
వాం మియువర దాలవస్తినవళ్ళ
ట్ట
రోంళ్ళకు శ్మిధిశించాంత్రి, వ్రే
శ్మనుతివేంకటిచశమణాభ్యాస్త్రి
నన్నిధిశించాంత్రి, శ్రీవిశ్వ
నెంపం కల్పుంరు నెంపం

బరంవదుగ్ నన్ను డేపిరంచి నాం విలాంసియిరుశ్రే శ్రీ నెంకిరం
శన్నిస్థానిక శ్రీనివాంచ్యేయ్యుంగాంత్రుంచి బోంశ్రీ ట్లోయ్యుం
శ్రీ ంచేవిరు వచ్చినిశోంట్టిరు వుద్దరింద నన్ను డేపినంన బం
వదుగ్ రవ్వినిబుట్టి వోంళ్ళవిన్నిధిశించాంత్రి. శ్రీవిందరుగనెం
రంయున్న బెబోంశ్రీ ట్లోయ్యుంగాంత్రు డేపినంగుం వ్రేంళ్ళగు బోం
రవ రవుణాన్ట్లు సిద్ధాన్నిధిశించాంత్రి శ్రీనివాం
య్యుంగాంత్రు డేపినంగుం ఈ లాంసాంయ్యు బరంవదుగ్ గాం

ల్మాడ్రిసి రెల్లు శోశిదు శోంళ్ళివంరోవుంరినిబోలేదు, ఇ
దగమ్మబ్బినంగుం ఫ్లీనసవాంగు వుదిల్లు వొద్దరింద వినాభవాశ్చ
యంరి ఆ వయుంల్లు ఫ్లీవిసిబోలేంరలుం ఇదే ఆ ద్దరింద గ
మేరకు మంత్రికిల్లు శోశిదు కోంళ్ళి బోరేం దురుబోల్ర
ఆశ్చర్యకర లాంయితు వరంయుంచిరి
నరుగాం బాలాంరుజు ఎందు ఇచ్చినట్లు

శ్రీరంగశర్మదగ్గిరుంచి శ్రీ వేల్లో
వెళ్ళిపోడ్డాగదోవరంశ్రే
శ్రీరంగశర్మదరంగశాస్త్రి
ఎవరదోవసిసినదగ్గిమ్మే
మిళిపోత్ర బాంతిరిచే

72 ఓ రు సన లిఖిత స్టాంపు బ

దు

EIGHT ANNAS

[illegible] 6-1-17 [illegible]

[illegible]

3 [illegible] 2-60 … … 26

264 [illegible] 210 … … … 215

[illegible]

[illegible] 4-1-17 [illegible] 0-1-6
[illegible] 5.[illegible]
[illegible]

18

46

2020 3	2 6 0		2 6 0
2626 4	2 1 0		2

ಕಾಲಮಾನ ಮತ್ತು ಸಮಯ

ಕಾಲಮಾನ ಎಂದರೆ ಒಂದು ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಸೂರ್ಯನು ಮಧ್ಯಾಹ್ನ ಆಕಾಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಅತ್ಯುನ್ನತ ಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿರುವಾಗ ಆ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಗಡಿಯಾರವು ತೋರಿಸುವ ಸಮಯ. ಭೂಮಿಯು ಪಶ್ಚಿಮದಿಂದ ಪೂರ್ವಕ್ಕೆ ಸುತ್ತುತ್ತಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಪೂರ್ವದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಸ್ಥಳಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸೂರ್ಯನು ಮೊದಲು ಕಾಣಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾನೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಪೂರ್ವದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಸ್ಥಳಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮಧ್ಯಾಹ್ನ ಮೊದಲು ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಪಶ್ಚಿಮದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಸ್ಥಳಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮಧ್ಯಾಹ್ನ ನಂತರ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಪೂರ್ವದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಸ್ಥಳಗಳ ಕಾಲಮಾನವು ಪಶ್ಚಿಮದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಸ್ಥಳಗಳ ಕಾಲಮಾನಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಮುಂದಿರುತ್ತದೆ.

ಭೂಮಿಯು ಒಂದು ಸುತ್ತು ಸುತ್ತಲು ಸುಮಾರು ೨೪ ಗಂಟೆಗಳು ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಪ್ರತಿ ೧೫ ಡಿಗ್ರಿ ರೇಖಾಂಶಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಗಂಟೆಯಷ್ಟು ಕಾಲಮಾನದ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸವಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಂದರೆ ೧ ಡಿಗ್ರಿ ರೇಖಾಂಶಕ್ಕೆ ೪ ನಿಮಿಷಗಳಷ್ಟು ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸವಿರುತ್ತದೆ.

ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗೆ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಮತ್ತು ಮಂಗಳೂರಿನ ರೇಖಾಂಶಗಳ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸ ೨ ಡಿಗ್ರಿ ೩೦ ನಿಮಿಷಗಳು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿನ ಕಾಲಮಾನವು ಮಂಗಳೂರಿನ ಕಾಲಮಾನಕ್ಕಿಂತ ೧೦ ನಿಮಿಷಗಳಷ್ಟು ಮುಂದಿರುತ್ತದೆ.

ಭಾರತದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದೇ ಕಾಲಮಾನವನ್ನು ಬಳಸಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಭಾರತೀಯ ಪ್ರಮಾಣಿತ ಕಾಲಮಾನ (IST) ಎಂದು ಕರೆಯಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. IST ಯು ೮೨.೫ ಡಿಗ್ರಿ ಪೂರ್ವ ರೇಖಾಂಶದ ಕಾಲಮಾನವಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದು ಅಲಹಾಬಾದ್ ಬಳಿಯ ಮಿರ್ಜಾಪುರ ಮೂಲಕ ಹಾದುಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಸಮಯ ಎಂದರೆ ಒಂದು ಘಟನೆ ನಡೆಯುವ ಅಥವಾ ಒಂದು ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಲು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಅವಧಿ. ಸಮಯವನ್ನು ಗಂಟೆ, ನಿಮಿಷ ಮತ್ತು ಸೆಕೆಂಡುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅಳೆಯಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ೧ ಗಂಟೆ = ೬೦ ನಿಮಿಷಗಳು, ೧ ನಿಮಿಷ = ೬೦ ಸೆಕೆಂಡುಗಳು.

ಸಮಯವನ್ನು ಅಳೆಯಲು ಗಡಿಯಾರ ಮತ್ತು ಕೈಗಡಿಯಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಬಳಸಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಗಡಿಯಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಮೂರು ಮುಳ್ಳುಗಳಿರುತ್ತವೆ. ಚಿಕ್ಕ ಮುಳ್ಳು ಗಂಟೆಗಳನ್ನು, ದೊಡ್ಡ ಮುಳ್ಳು ನಿಮಿಷಗಳನ್ನು ಮತ್ತು ತೆಳ್ಳಗಿನ ಮುಳ್ಳು ಸೆಕೆಂಡುಗಳನ್ನು ತೋರಿಸುತ್ತದೆ.

ಒಂದು ಗಡಿಯಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ೧೨ ಗಂಟೆಗಳಿರುತ್ತವೆ. ಪ್ರತಿ ಗಂಟೆಯ ನಡುವೆ ೫ ನಿಮಿಷಗಳ ಅಂತರವಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಒಂದು ಗಡಿಯಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ೬೦ ನಿಮಿಷಗಳಿರುತ್ತವೆ.

ಸಮಯವನ್ನು ಎರಡು ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ೧೨ ಗಂಟೆಯ ಪದ್ಧತಿ ಮತ್ತು ೨೪ ಗಂಟೆಯ ಪದ್ಧತಿ. ೧೨ ಗಂಟೆಯ ಪದ್ಧತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬೆಳಿಗ್ಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ಸಂಜೆಯನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸಲು AM ಮತ್ತು PM ಬಳಸಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ೨೪ ಗಂಟೆಯ ಪದ್ಧತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ೦೦:೦೦ ರಿಂದ ೨೩:೫೯ ವರೆಗೆ ಸಮಯವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗೆ, ಮಧ್ಯಾಹ್ನ ೧೨ ಗಂಟೆಯನ್ನು ೨೪ ಗಂಟೆಯ ಪದ್ಧತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ೧೨:೦೦ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಮಧ್ಯರಾತ್ರಿ ೧೨ ಗಂಟೆಯನ್ನು ೨೪ ಗಂಟೆಯ ಪದ್ಧತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ೦೦:೦೦ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಸಮಯವನ್ನು ಲೆಕ್ಕಾಚಾರ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಗಂಟೆಗಳನ್ನು ಗಂಟೆಗಳೊಂದಿಗೆ, ನಿಮಿಷಗಳನ್ನು ನಿಮಿಷಗಳೊಂದಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ಸೆಕೆಂಡುಗಳನ್ನು ಸೆಕೆಂಡುಗಳೊಂದಿಗೆ ಕೂಡಿಸಬೇಕು ಅಥವಾ ಕಳೆಯಬೇಕು. ಒಂದು ಘಟನೆಯ ಆರಂಭ ಮತ್ತು ಅಂತ್ಯದ ಸಮಯಗಳನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದಿದ್ದರೆ, ಅವಧಿಯನ್ನು ಕಂಡುಹಿಡಿಯಲು ಅಂತ್ಯದ ಸಮಯದಿಂದ ಆರಂಭದ ಸಮಯವನ್ನು ಕಳೆಯಬೇಕು.

ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗೆ, ಒಂದು ಸಿನಿಮಾ ಬೆಳಿಗ್ಗೆ ೧೦:೩೦ ಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭವಾಗಿ ಮಧ್ಯಾಹ್ನ ೧:೦೦ ಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಗಿದರೆ, ಸಿನಿಮಾದ ಅವಧಿ ೨ ಗಂಟೆ ೩೦ ನಿಮಿಷಗಳು.

ಸಮಯವನ್ನು ಲೆಕ್ಕಾಚಾರ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಕೆಲವೊಮ್ಮೆ ಸಾಲವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗಬಹುದು. ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗೆ, ೧೦:೩೦ ರಿಂದ ೧೨:೦೦ ಕ್ಕೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಸಮಯವಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಕಂಡುಹಿಡಿಯಲು, ೧೨:೦೦ ರಿಂದ ೧೦:೩೦ ಅನ್ನು ಕಳೆಯಬೇಕು. ೧೨ ರಿಂದ ೧೦ ಅನ್ನು ಕಳೆಯಲು ೧ ಗಂಟೆಯನ್ನು ಸಾಲವಾಗಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಆಗ ೧೨:೦೦ ಅನ್ನು ೧೧:೬೦ ಎಂದು ಬರೆಯಬಹುದು. ಈಗ ೧೧:೬೦ ರಿಂದ ೧೦:೩೦ ಅನ್ನು ಕಳೆದರೆ ೧ ಗಂಟೆ ೩೦ ನಿಮಿಷಗಳು ಉತ್ತರ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ.

ಸಮಯವನ್ನು ಲೆಕ್ಕಾಚಾರ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಕೆಲವೊಮ್ಮೆ ಸಾಲವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗಬಹುದು. ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗೆ, ೧೦:೩೦ ರಿಂದ ೧೨:೦೦ ಕ್ಕೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಸಮಯವಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಕಂಡುಹಿಡಿಯಲು, ೧೨:೦೦ ರಿಂದ ೧೦:೩೦ ಅನ್ನು ಕಳೆಯಬೇಕು. ೧೨ ರಿಂದ ೧೦ ಅನ್ನು ಕಳೆಯಲು ೧ ಗಂಟೆಯನ್ನು ಸಾಲವಾಗಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಆಗ ೧೨:೦೦ ಅನ್ನು ೧೧:೬೦ ಎಂದು ಬರೆಯಬಹುದು. ಈಗ ೧೧:೬೦ ರಿಂದ ೧೦:೩೦ ಅನ್ನು ಕಳೆದರೆ ೧ ಗಂಟೆ ೩೦ ನಿಮಿಷಗಳು ಉತ್ತರ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ.

ಸಮಯವನ್ನು ಲೆಕ್ಕಾಚಾರ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಕೆಲವೊಮ್ಮೆ ಸಾಲವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗಬಹುದು. ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗೆ, ೧೦:೩೦ ರಿಂದ ೧೨:೦೦ ಕ್ಕೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಸಮಯವಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಕಂಡುಹಿಡಿಯಲು, ೧೨:೦೦ ರಿಂದ ೧೦:೩೦ ಅನ್ನು ಕಳೆಯಬೇಕು. ೧೨ ರಿಂದ ೧೦ ಅನ್ನು ಕಳೆಯಲು ೧ ಗಂಟೆಯನ್ನು ಸಾಲವಾಗಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಆಗ ೧೨:೦೦ ಅನ್ನು ೧೧:೬೦ ಎಂದು ಬರೆಯಬಹುದು. ಈಗ ೧೧:೬೦ ರಿಂದ ೧೦:೩೦ ಅನ್ನು ಕಳೆದರೆ ೧ ಗಂಟೆ ೩೦ ನಿಮಿಷಗಳು ಉತ್ತರ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ.

EIGHT ANNAS ٨-٢

OFFICE
FIRST M...
N...

99
... JUL 1931
CENL & REVENUE ...
M...

[illegible]

I this will be placed to the Connected Appeal file which is in Pres. For perusal

24/7

25.7.31

ఠాణాలో ఫిర్యాదు చేస్తామని అనుకుంటూ
ఎంచక్కా ఫోన్ లో వచ్చిన మెసేజ్ లు చదివి వాళ్ళ అబ్బాయికి
వాళ్ళ బంధువులకు వాట్సాప్ లో ఫార్వర్డ్ చేసి కాసేపు ఫ్రీగా ఉన్నారు

కాకి 20.7.31

OFFICE ... FIRST MEMBER ... COUNCIL
27 JULY 1931
No. M.4.44

M ... ✓ ... (initials)

ಮೈಸೂರು ಶ್ರೀ ಮುಜರಾಯಿ ಕಮೀಷನರ್ ಸಾಹೇಬರವರ
ಹುಜೂರು ಮಹಾಸನ್ನಿಧಾನಂಗಳಿಗೆ—

ಶ್ರೀರಂಗಪಟ್ಟಣದ ಶ್ರೀರಂಗನಾಥಸ್ವಾಮಿಯವರ ದೇವಸ್ಥಾನದ ಅರ್ಚಕ ಸನ್ನಿಧಿ ಅರ್ಚಕರಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ನೌಕರರು ಗುಡಿ ಪರಿಚಾರಕರು ಯಿಲ್ಲ ದಬರಾಲಿ ... ದಾರಮತ್ತು ರಕ್ಷೆ ದಾತ್ರಾವ ... ಕಡೆ ಕೇಶವರಂಗಾಚಾರ್ಯನು ಬರೆದುಕೊಂಡ ಅರ್ಜಿ—

ಶ್ರೀಯವರ ದೇವಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಸಂತ್ರಲುಗುಡಿ ಮತ್ತು ಚಿಕ್ಕ ಗುಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ರಕ್ಷ್ಯದಾತ್ರಿಂದಾ ಕಪ್ಪಿಸಿ ಕೆಯಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದ ಚೇತನ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಶ್ರೀರಂಗನಾಯಕಿ ಅಮ್ಮನವರ ಗುಡಿಯ ... ದುರಂಗ ಕರಿದಿಂದಾ ಕೇಳಿದ್ದು ... ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಿ ಅವರ ... ಮಿಕ್ಕ ದರ್ಬಾರುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಲದಹರಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದು ರಕ್ಷೆ ದಾರಿ ... ಬಡ್ಡಿ ಅಪ್ಪ ... ಪತ್ರಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಿ ... ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಶ್ರೀರಂಗನಾಯಕಿ ಅಮ್ಮನವರ ಗುಡಿಯ ... ರಕ್ಷೆ ದಾರಿ ... ಇದ್ದ ಮತ್ತು ಯಿಲ್ಲ ಇವರು ಸಂಪಾದನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಯ್ಯ ... ಸ್ವಾಮಿಯವರಿಗೆ ಗೋತ್ರಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಿವರು ಹಾಲಿನ ... ಇದ್ದ ಬರಾಲ ... ಕೆಲಸಗಳ ಬಾಬ್ತು ಬರಾಲ ... ಕ್ಷಿನಲ್ಲ ... ಮಾಡಿರುವ ೧೮೯೫ ಇಸ್ವಿ ... ಮಾಡಿದ ಬಾಬ್ತು ಬರಾಲ ... ಸನ್ನಿಧಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ... ವಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಸಂಗಡ ... ನಿರುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಸ್ವಾಮಿ—

ಇದೇ ಅಮ್ಮನವರ ಸನ್ನಿಧಿ ಅರ್ಚಕರಿಗೆ ಹಿಂದೆ ಬರುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದ ಕಲಯಿಯಿಲ್ಲ ... ಸಂತ್ರಲುಗುಡಿ ಪರಿಚಾರಕರು ... ಯಿಲ್ಲಾ ೧೮೯೫ ಇಸ್ವಿ ಅಕ್ಟೋಬರ್ (ಮಾರ್ಚಿ) ... ಅರ್ಜಿ ಸಂಗಡ ... ನಿರುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಯಿಲ್ಲ ... ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಸ್ವಾಮಿ—

ಶ್ರೀ ... ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಶ್ರೀರಂಗನಾಯಕಿ ಅಮ್ಮನವರ ... ಗುಡಿ ... ಪ್ರಸನ್ನ ವೆಂಕಟರಮಣ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ... ಪರಿಚಾರಕರುಗಳ ... ಗಳ ... ಪರಿಚಾರಕರುಗಳು ... ಹಿಂದಿನಿಂದಾ ಬಂದದ್ದಲ್ಲಾ (ಹಿಂದಿನಿಂದಾ ಬಂದದ್ದಲ್ಲಾ) ಯಿವರು ... ಸಂಪಾದನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿ ... ಪ್ರಸನ್ನ ವೆಂಕಟರಮಣ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ... ಕೆಲಸ ೪-೫ ... ಯಿ

This will be placed in the connected file ... known thus
MB (initials)
3/7
(initials)
1.8.31







OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER
IN MYSORE,

Bangalore...1st...December... ...193
19

FROM

S. HIRIANAIYA, ESQ., M.A., B.L.,
~~SRI RANGOPALACHARI, ESQ., B.A., B.L.,~~

Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

To Muz. 64-30-7

Rajasevaparayane
P.Srinivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,

Secretary to Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,

E.J.D. & A.I. *Department.*

SIR,

I with reference to your letter [illegible] collins for remission [illegible] Rajamanyam and [illegible] Gerrard to, I have the honor to submit [illegible] 30-5-11 (enclosed in the file) [illegible] which rights [illegible] was made jointly in [illegible] having studied, [illegible]

[illegible] Sri would [illegible] Rangaiah involved [illegible] the [illegible] to the term. [illegible] of the [illegible] revision of the scale in 1903, [illegible] the Partnership [illegible]

[illegible] Iyengar [illegible] right, [illegible] rights of the [illegible] which [illegible] ointments. and went over to others

[illegible] revision, [illegible]

1.R 6/- Vegetable [illegible]
2." 1-4-11 Cajanus [illegible]

remuneration in respect of item No.1 raised from R 6/ to F 8

B old allowance to this man referred to in your letter was an acting allowance he was getting, as can be seen from the baraward extract he has produced.

With regard to the petition of Campachkumaracharl, it is seen that the baraward of Alwar Sannidhi which stood originally in the name of one Vedugiriamma was transferred in 1916 to Sthanik Rangacharlengar but on an appeal filed by Rajengar, this was cancelled and Rajengar was allowed to act as before. On the death of Vedugiriamma in 1919, Shamachas, Kuppasamiengar and Rangacharlengar contested for the post of Alwar Sannidhi Perlonarike before the Sub Division Officer who ordered that the baraward be continued in the old name until production of heir ship certificate by the contesting parties.

The entire records received from the Deputy Commissioner together with Campachkumaracharl's petition are herewith forwarded for reference

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Asst. Commissioner.

No. RC454 & 3 files 30-31 OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE,

Bangalore, 10. 1931

FROM S. HIRIYANNA, Esq., M.A., Mgt.,
S. P RAJAGOPALACHARI, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

To

Quest: 64-30-8 P. Srinivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
.....*Department.*

SIR,

Officer on 6-1-25 who ordered on 30-3-25 that the appointments Puja Paudia and Pidi Paudia should be in accordance with the Government Order of 1922.

5 Consequent upon a communication issued from the temple Peshkar about the distribution of Parichattike duties among the 4 Sthaniks, petitions were presented to the Sub Division Officer praying that the duty of Pidi Paudia should not be given to Sthanik Bangaramaiengar. A detailed enquiry was held and the Sub Division Officer passed orders distributing the duties among the 4 Sthanikas. The distribution was not in accordance with the Government Order, and a call was preferred to the Deputy Commissioner who confirmed the Sub Division Officer's order observing that the Government Order in question was not applicable to the Devaswom where the old order of succession should be strictly followed, in the absence of any custom to the contrary. Against this order an appeal was filed before the Commissioner who in Appeal No.15/29-30 held that the Sub Division Officer had wrongly confirmed and sanctioned scale and ordered officers on the appointments as per old scale, to the detriment of the appellant and opined that no provision in the new scale; that any alteration could be sanctioned only by Government and that the appellant had no right to draw the scale in the manner they have done and that as the new scale is approved by Government it should not be varied. The Deputy Commissioner reports that the allocation made in Government Order of 1922 has not so far been altered to. The entire records of the case with the Deputy Commissioner's letter No. H.304/29 dated 15-7-31 are submitted herewith together with this office file of appeal No.15/29-30.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant

Munro Commissioner.

D. No. 3006 & 378

(G)

Before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Mu 30 - Appeal No. 3 of 1930-1931

~~Appellants~~ Petitioners

1) Keshava Ranga Bhatta representing Sowmanyakamma widow of Krishna Bhatta.
2) Shanbh Raja Iyengar
3) Narasimha Rajaswamiengar all residing in Srirangapatna

Vs.

~~Respondent~~ Counter petitioner.

Shanbh Rangaswami Iyengar -

Subject.

Appeal against the decision of the M.C in misc appl 15 of 29-30 on the file of this Court regarding the distribution of Panchamrutha work of certain Sattadaru in the Sri Ranganatha Swami temple at Srirangapatna -

---

Notice of 7/7/32 = Issued "

This case was heard on 23.3.1931. The petitioners were all present. The Counter petitioner was also present and was represented by his Lawyer Mr. L. S. Raja.

Order.

According to the old scale Sowmanyakamma & Narasimha Rajaswamiengar & Keshava Ranga Bhatta

GPB—1,000—S.S-11

revised Scale. Ther Claim
allowance attached to the Parish
three Sri Kalyanis, in addition to increased
emoluments is untenable.

Kalyanis Paiyana and Kalyani

Venkatachariar and Swami Panchakshi claimed
by Shanta Raja Iyengar for and allegated
both other appointments during the revision of
the scale of the
Sri Ranganatha Swami temple State in 1922.
This arrangement was necessary in the interests
of the Institution and can not be modified

~~The~~ Rajagopala Vanada Puja Claimed by
Narasimha Rangaswamiengar the post was
abolished during the revision of 1922, its duties having
been attached to others

Narasimha Rangaswamiengar Before the
revision of 1922 was drawing Rs 4-4-11 on
account of the following posts.—
Rs
i Yagasala Panchakshi 6-0-0
ii Gajendra Varadapooja 1-4-11. of these,
the second post was abolished during the
said revision of 1922, the duties there of having
been attached to others. Nevertheless he has
been drawing Rs 8/- even now
higher emoluments & the extent of

The other allowance of Rs-3/- alleged as now been
drawn before revision on
of Srikal gnoi. Sri Vada was an extra allowance to which
and he was drawing it only temporarily
an allowance and he can not claim
it as a matter of fact. In view of these
facts the petitioner has no claim to any higher

Item 55 list
Page 7

Enclosure A.

G. R. S. App F. G. 3.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Continuation sheet draft form.)

(1) No 126/Rev 64-30-10 dt 18.7.32 — (1) Copy to Keshavadasa Bhavan B-o

(2) No 127/Rev 64-30-11 dt 18-7-32 — (2) Copy to Shanta Raja Sujana

(3) No 128/Rev 64-30-12 do — (3) Copy to Narasimha Ramasam

(4) No 129/Rev 64-3013 do — (4) Copy to Mr L. S. Raju Advocate Bangalore

No 125/Rev: 64-30-9 dt 18.7.1932 — Copy to M. C. Rangaswamy with forwarding letter to records received

D. 4-8-32 — No 307/30-31 dt 19-9-3 B-o

9/7/32

To See Enquiry

Govt

577

Appendix F G—1]

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

Section Mung

File No. 64-30

Serial No. 14

Diary No. of letter replied to ...300+378

No. 130/Mung

To

Thanik Sampathkumaracharyar
Son of Thammanna
Srirangapatnam

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193*

Date of issue ...18-7-1932...

Signed by ...B.B. Mundkur Thasildar...

With reference to his/their letter dated 23/3/32 filed before V. Keshaviengar Advocate regarding the Paisachik of Sri Alwar Sannidhi - Sri Ranganath Swamis Temple - Srirangapatnam, Thanik Sampathkumaracharyar is informed that he should submit his representation to the local Munsif authorities in the first instance.

orders given to Asst see on 9/7/32 & issued

List of enclosures .....

Copied by .....

Examined by .....

For the Secretary.